#### **REMARKS**

Claims 64, 66-69, 71, 75-84, and 87-98 were pending in the application. By this paper, claims 75-78, 82-84, and 91 have been amended. Claims 59, 63, 65, and 72 have been cancelled. Claims 64, 66-69, 71, 75-84 and 87-98 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are hereby respectfully solicited in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **Telephone Interview with Supervisor David Dunn**

Applicant would like to express its appreciation to Supervisor Dunn for his time and courtesy in discussing the present application in the telephone interview which took place on April 24, 2007. Applicant and the Examiner discussed the patentability of the claims presented herein over the cited prior art.

# Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 83 and 84 are rejected because the claim language "perimeters" are not supported. Applicant has amended claims 83 and 84 to replace "perimeters" with "object holders" thereby overcoming the rejections.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 83-84 is respectfully requested.

#### Claim Objections

Claim 91 is objected to because the semi-colon at the end of the last paragraph should be replaced by a period. Claim 91 has been amended accordingly.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 75-78, 82-84, and 91-98 have been rejected as being obvious in view of the combination of Kain '862 in view of Kain '509.

As discussed during the telephone interview by Applicant and Supervisor Dunn, independent claim 75 recites an object holder that is movable to a fully retracted, storage position whereby the object holder can be retracted no further into the base and a portion of each object holder extends beyond the base and presents a gripping surface configured to be engaged so as to articulate the object holder from the fully retracted position to the extended position.

Independent 91 is similar to claim 75, but recites a pair of object holders that, when in a fully retracted, storage position, can be retracted no further into the base and a portion of each object holder extends beyond the base and presents a gripping surface configured to be engaged so as to articulate the object holder from the fully retracted position to the extended position.

Likewise, independent claim 95 recites, in part, 1) a recess defined by an enclosed perimeter; and 2) an object holder that, when in the fully retracted, storage position, can be retracted no further into the base, and a portion of the object holder extends beyond the recess.

In Kain '862, when the object holder is in the retracted position, the object holder does not extend beyond the base. For instance, as illustrated in Fig. 5, the retracted object holder does not extend beyond the platform 90. Accordingly, Kain '862, even when combined with Kain '509 in the manner suggested in the Office Action, fails to teach or suggest each limitation recited in claims 75 and 91.

Accordingly, Applicant asserts that independent claims 75, 91, and 95 and corresponding dependent claims 76-78, 82-84, and 92-94 and 96-98 are allowable over the cited prior art. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 75-78, 82-84, and 91-98 is therefore respectfully requested.

## **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claim rejections and allowance of the pending claims. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below in order to discuss any remaining issues or matters of form that will place this case in condition for allowance.

No fee is believed to be due for this communication. If, however, a fee is due for this or any other communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to withdraw such fees from Deposit Account No. 50-3866.

Respectfully submitted,

Adam J. Forman Reg. No. 46,707

Lempia Forman LLC

223 W. Jackson Blvd. Suite 620, Brooks Bldg.

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 291-0860

April 27, 2007